AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CLIMATE AT GREENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DES MOINES, IOWA

An abstract of a Field Report by
Nicholas J. Aalbers
January 1977
Drake University
Advisor: Dr. Richard Brooks

The problem. There are a number of varied populations that a single school community finds itself attempting to serve. Students, parents, central administration, teachers and other staff members have different perspectives, thoughts and concerns regarding their school. This study is designed to determine present group perceptions in a given school community.

Procedures. The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was administered to students, parents, central administration, teachers and other staff members associated with or served by this school. Responses to the profile questionnaire by these various groups comprise the data for this study. An analysis of variance for the differences between means of the five groups on both "What Is" and "What Should Be" was run by the Computer Center at Drake University. Differences between means of "What Is" and "What Should Be" in the combined groups with the t being the test statistic was also run by the Center. The Scheffe Method was used to compare differences between pairs of means in the area where the analysis of variance was significant.

Findings. In comparing the mean differences between groups in responses to climate characteristics for "What Is" there appeared to be eight pairs of means that were significantly different. The Scheffe Method of Comparison was used to compare the eight significantly different pairs of means and for the item characteristic of effective teaching and learning strategies "What Is" there was a significant difference between means for teachers and students with the students viewing this characteristic more positive than teachers. The results or comparing differences between means for "What Is" and "What Should Be" across all groups indicate that there is a significant difference between the "What Is" and "What Should be". The direction of difference is that the "What Should Be" mean across all groups was greater than the "What Is" mean across all groups.

Conclusions. There is very little difference in how the previously mentioned groups perceive the climate at Greenwood School. The climate is perceived by the various groups as being good but not ideal. Teachers are more critical of their effectiveness than any of the other groups and administrators are the most positive about the school's climate.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CLIMATE AT GREENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DES MOINES, IOWA

A Field Report

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

---

by

Nicholas J. Aalbers

January 1977

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CLIMATE AT GREENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, DES MOINES, IOWA

by

Nicholas J. Aalbers

Approved by Committee:

Dr. Richard Brooks
Chairperson

Dr. Richard Lampshire

Dr. Earle L. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Many educators have the opportunity to visit various educational institutions from time to time. The comment is often made that individuals "like" and "feel good" about a particular school or have a "cool" or "unwanted" feeling in another school. There are many reasons why individuals "feel good" about a school as well as why some have a "cool" feeling about another school. Essentially what is being referred to is the "climate" of the school organization.

Each school has a "climate" that is unique to that particular institution. It is the personality of the school.

The usual writings on the characteristics of a good school program describe the nature of curriculum and the instruction program. They typically describe (1) desirable classroom teaching-learning strategies and conditions, and (2) courses and experiences to be offered within each area of curricular and extra-curricular programs. These are certainly real and legitimate concerns; however, there are other dimensions that must be taken into consideration when developing a "good" school program. Perhaps the fundamental dimension is need for a "humane school climate."

Boies and Brainard suggest the following goals of the humane school climate:

> To provide throughout the school a wholesome, stimulating and productive learning environment conducive to academic achievement and personal growth of youth at different levels of development.
>
> To provide a pleasant and satisfying school situation within which young people can live and work.[1]

These primary goals focus on the young people for whom schools exist. A corollary is provision of a stimulating and productive environment for the adults of the school community--the faculty, principal, other staff members, and parents.

To summarize, it is felt that productivity and satisfaction can increase in schools where the climate is described as humane.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

At the present time there are a number of varied populations that a single school community finds itself attempting to serve. Students, parents, central administration, teachers and other staff members have different perspectives, thoughts and concerns regarding their school. How an administrator functions within this setting is dependent on how the various groups feel about their school.

As the various groups within a single school

---

[1]Herbert E. Boies and Edward Brainard, "School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator," Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, p. 5.

community interpret what is happening, from their perspective, individuals often run into disagreement. The disagreement between groups has a bearing on how members within each group respond to their responsibilities or to members of the other groups when they come in contact with each other.

If disagreement between groups is to be held at a minimum it is necessary that they have similar perceptions of the school.

Before any activity can be generated to get similarity of perceptions between groups it is essential to know what their current perceptions are. This study is designed to determine present group perceptions in a given school community.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to (1) determine, for a given elementary school, the extent to which there is a difference between "What Is" and "What Should Be" in the areas of General Climate Factors, Program Determinants, Process Determinants and Material Determinants as perceived by students, parents, central administration, teachers, and other staff members; and (2) to determine the extent of agreement and disagreement between groups (students, parents, central administration, teachers, and other staff members)

in their perceptions of the climate characteristics named above.

PROCEDURES

Permission was obtained from the Des Moines Public Schools, Assistant Superintendent for Education, Dr. Robert R. Denny, to perform the study. The school community selected for study was Greenwood Elementary School.

The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was administered to students, parents, central administration, teachers and other staff members associated with or served by this school. Responses to the profile questionnaire by these various groups comprised the data for this study. An Analysis of Variance for the Differences between means of five groups (students, parents, central administration, teachers and other staff members) on both "What Is" and "What Should Be" was run by Dial Finance Computer Center at Drake University. Differences between means of "What Is" and "What Should Be" in the combined groups was also run by this computer center with the t being the test statistic.

The Scheffe method was used to compare differences between pairs of means in areas where the analysis of variance was significant.

Assumptions made regarding the study are: (1) individuals were honest in their responses, and (2) the instrument selected was appropriate and adequate to find the

desired information.

Limitations to the study are: (1) there is one school community involved, and (2) there are only certain aspects of the school investigated and those pertained to climate.

Two hypotheses will be tested in this study. They are:

Hypothesis #1
There are no differences in the perceptions of school climate characteristics between parents, students, central administration, teachers and other staff members.

Hypothesis #2
In the combined groups, there are no differences in perceptions of "What Is" and "What Should Be" on the school climate characteristics.

Because of the number of analyses to be run, and then the need for protection against a Type I error, no result will be considered significant with a probability greater than .01.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

During the past decade there have been many changes in the American school system. There have been many new school buildings with unique and innovative construction and architecture. New developments and advances have been made in program organization, scheduling alternatives, individualized instruction, open-spaces, multimedia instructional materials, PPBS, MBO, differentiated staffing and career education, just to mention a few.

Despite these strides success in creating the kinds of schools educators would like to have has not been achieved. Lack of discipline, disrespect for faculty, apathy, negativism, poor attitudes, poor self-concepts, dislike of faculty, lack of supplies, low staff morale, under-achieving students, dropping test scores, faculty cliques, faculty discontent and poor community relations are concerns of staff, students and parents in many schools.

If an organization is to be successful, productive and satisfying the organization must provide opportunities for students, staff and community to fulfill basic human needs. An effective, positive climate cannot exist without meeting such needs. Abraham Maslow indicates fulfillment of basic human needs is essential to a positive environment. Maslow's hierarchy of human needs to maximize one's

potentials is as follows:

1. Achievement and recognition
2. Acceptance and friendship
3. Safety
4. Physiological[1]

Maslow gives useful insight into explaining the need for members of an organization to participate in the direction the organization is to take.

In the realm of education a widely accepted definition of climate has been provided by Halpin and Croft. To them organizational climate is the "personality" of the organization, the school.[2] They indicate that some schools are pleasant to work in, whereas others are not.

Rensis Likert referred to organizational climate in terms of physical environment, cultural environment and technological environment. In discussing the characteristics of the authoritative and participative systems of management, Likert referred to aspects of organizational climate inherent in each system. Under the Exploitive Authoritative system, for example, the employees have "subservient attitudes toward superiors coupled with hostility towards peers and contempt for subordinates, distrust is

---

[1]Larry Burden and Robert L. Whitt, The Community School Principal (Midland, Michigan: Pendall Publishing Co., 1973), p. 9.

[2]Andrew W. Halpin and Donald W. Croft, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 131-253.

widespread." Under the Participative Group almost the opposite environment prevails in that "favorable, cooperative attitudes throughout the organization, with mutual trust and confidence" exist.[1]

Renato Tagiuri in "The Concept of Organizational Climate" offers the following definition:

> Organizational climate is relatively enduring quality of an organization that: (1) is experienced by its members, (2) influences their behavior, and (3) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attitudes) of the organization.[2]

In their studies regarding climate: (1) structure and constraint, (2) emphasis on individual responsibility, (3) warmth and support, (4) reward and punishment, approval and disapproval, (5) conflict and tolerance for conflict, (6) performance standards and expectations, (7) organizational identity and group loyalty, and (8) risk and risk taking.[3]

Andrew Halpin and Don Croft presented the most extensive findings on organizational climate of schools. Through the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ)

---

[1]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), pp. 222-236.

[2]Renato Tagiuri, "The Concept of Organizational Climate," Organizational Climate, eds. Renato Tagiuri and George Litwin (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 27.

[3]George H. Litwin and Robert Stringer, Jr., Motivation and Organizational Climate (Boston: Division of Research, Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 45-65.

instrument, which they developed, they were able to classify schools in one of six organizational climates. The six climates are: (1) open, (2) autonomous, (3) controlled, (4) familiar, (5) paternal, and (6) closed. To classify a school in an organizational climate they found it necessary to get scores for a school on eight dimensions, four for the teachers as a group, and four for the principal as leader. For teachers, the dimensions are: (1) disengagement, (2) hindrance, (3) esprit, and (4) intimacy. For principals, the dimensions are: (1) aloofness, (2) production, (3) emphasis, and (4) trust and consideration.[1]

In order to delineate distinct profiles of organizational climates, Halpin and Croft developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to measure climates, ranging on a continuum from "open" to "closed". They are described as follows:

1. The Open Climate describes an energetic, lively organization which is moving towards its goals and which provides satisfaction for the group members' personal needs.
2. The Autonomous Climate is described as one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group.
3. The Controlled Climate is characterized best as impersonal and highly task-oriented.
4. The Familiar Climate is highly personal, but uncontrolled.
5. The Paternal Climate is characterized best as one in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself.

---

[1]Halpin and Croft, pp. 145-181.

6. The Closed Climate is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization.[1]

A school administrator and a faculty could use this instrument to find out how teachers perceive the interaction between the administrator and staff, and thus check to some degree the congruence achieved in role expectations maintained by these individuals and groups within the school. By having a better understanding of the perceived organizational climate, the principal and staff can begin to work together to open up the system, if this be the need, and move the organization toward more acceptable goal behavior.[2]

At this time a number of reports and studies regarding climate will be reviewed.

In a report entitled "Organizational Climate in the More Effective Schools," Steinhoff and Owens present the findings of a study which assessed the organizational climate of the 21 More Effective Schools (MES) in New York City. The findings were gathered for the information of MES building principals. An organizational climate index (OCI) was distributed to MES teachers, and responses from 14 of the schools were analyzed. When the OCI scale, factor, and area means and sigma were computed and analyzed for each of these

---

[1]Halpin and Croft, loc. cit.

[2]Burden and Whitt, pp. 19-21.

schools, differences in the perception of the environment in the schools were found to exist. These differences, and the complex correlations between climate, pupil ethnicity, and student/teacher personnel variables, are reported. It is concluded that school reorganization and increased staff may not be effective ways to raise achievement levels. Rather, longer-term efforts to create certain fundamental and psychological and environmental conditions may be necessary to bring about academic achievement gains.[1]

It is clear that when one discusses the "climate" of an elementary school one must take into account all of the factors which affect the manifest behavior of the members of the organization. The dynamic interpersonal transactions between and among administrators, teachers, and pupils are differentially influenced by at least these factors: the ethnic and socio-cultural setting of the school; the orientation, experience and competence of the professional staff; the size of the building; and the capacity of the building administrators to take effective initiative under high load and stress conditions.

Development then becomes the key construct in the establishment of programs designed to improve the efficiency

---

[1]Carl R. Steinhoff and Robert G. Owens, Organizational Climate in the More Effective Schools (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 019 372, November, 1967), p. 3.

and effectiveness of schools. By "development" it is meant: the recognition that complex symbiotic relationships exist within an organization, that these relationships have a dynamic nature--that is, they interact and change over time--and that they must first be specified to a reasonable degree before any program of "intervention" is planned and initiated.[1]

"Here and Now" behavior in an organization may best be viewed in the perspective of the development of dynamic inter-relationships between individuals and between individuals and their environment over a period of time. The assessment of organizational development gives at least a "time-slice" view of the present. This implies that intervention priorities may be established according to the present level of organizational development of a given school.[2]

This study seems to cast some doubt on the efficacy of attempting to boost pupil achievement, as it is conventionally measured on achievement tests, by the relatively simplistic and expensive method of reorganizing schools and increasing their staffing. Rather, it would appear reasonable to suggest that long-term attempts to affect the development aspects of organizational life might set the stage

---

[1]Steinhoff and Owens, loc. cit.

[2]Ibid.

for more basic and significant changes to follow. It may well be that creating psychological and environmental conditions in the school organization designed to foster more adequate and meaningful climate is a prior condition to the attainment of the more readily visible end-product sought in schools: higher pupil achievement.[1]

In Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada and Utah, fifteen of the most innovative and fifteen of the least innovative schools (as identified by the Educational Innovation checklist developed by Hinman) were examined by Johnson and Marcum to: (1) determine whether there are significant differences between their organizational climates, (2) determine if differences exist between the teachers' and administrators' perceptions of school climate for the two kinds of schools, and (3) determine if there are differences between each of four variables (expenditure, staff age, years in the school, and staff size) for the two groups. Results of the study show that (1) highly innovative schools have open climates while less innovative schools have closed climates, (2) both teachers and administrators see a closed climate in non-innovative schools while in innovative schools both see an open climate, and (3) highly innovative schools spend more per child, have a younger staff, have staff that remain a fewer number of years, and are larger. It is

---

[1]Ibid.

concluded that organizational climate of schools in terms of openness and closedness is an important condition for change.[1]

On the assumption that innovative schools are continuously assessing goals and bringing about changes to achieve goals, one can make a logical connection between recent findings and Halpin's idea that the open climate describes an energetic, lively organization which is moving towards its goals, while the closed climate describes an organization which is not moving and is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization.

Finally, it must be added that a large burden of climate for change rests with the school principal, who, as a single individual has major effect on school climate. He alone is a chief agent in the openness or closedness of the organization. Of the eight dimensions measured by the OCDG, four are perceptions about the principal's specific behavior. It would seem, then, that principal selection and principal training, as well as the granting of authority and responsibility for the structural elements of a school to the principal, are basic to the development of a change in climate.

---

[1]Homer M. Johnson and R. Laverne Marcum, Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 028 517, February, 1969), p. 3.

During the past decade there has been an upsurge in the amount of research done on human environments. Sinclair points out the need to consider school environments:

> Up to now there has been considerable research done on individual differences, but relatively little has been done to measure differences among environments with which individuals interact. Different environments affect children in different ways, and to ignore variation in school climates is to limit our understanding of the various ways students think and feel.[1]

Results from research studies which do exist seem to establish the following trends or conclusions:

1. The environment is considered to be made up of perceived aspects which constitute a probable stimulus for promoting particular individual characteristics.
2. Behavior is a function of the transactional relationship between the individual and his environment.
3. The perceptions of individuals living in an environment are a source of valid description of that environment.

In light of the foregoing assumptions a study designed to assess pupils' perceptions of the educational environment seems worthy. A study of this nature should provide new insight into situational determinants of social, physical, and intellectual significance--thus assisting the staffs of schools in the planning of relevant educational programs.[2]

---

[1]Donald Moore and Russell Dobson, "Elementary School Childrens' Perceptions of the Educational Environment," Final Report, Project Number 1F047, Contract Number OBC71-0523-(609), U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Education Research and Development (Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, May 31, 1972), p. 2.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

The problem stated by Sinclair in this report[1] was to describe the educational environment of Oklahoma elementary schools as perceived by pupils who attend these schools, and to determine whether schools with differing characteristics differ in their educational environments. Answers to the following questions were sought.

1. Do elementary schools differ in their educational environment as perceived by pupils
   a. when the school environments differ?
   b. when the demographic features differ?
   c. when the socio-economic composition differs?
   d. when the sex of the principals differ?
   e. when the age of the teaching staffs differ?
   f. when the organizational plans differ?
   g. when open space facilities differ?[2]

The findings of the study considered to be most significant were the following:

1. Schools located in middle or high socio-economic class settings have a more academic, scholarly environment.
2. Rural school students perceive the environment as more considerate than do students attending urban schools.
3. Self-contained classrooms, when compared with other organizational structures, offers a more practical dimension to classroom management.
4. Educational environments of elementary schools do not differ significantly according to the variables of sex of principal, age variance of faculties, or enrollment size of the school.[3]

The following conclusions have been drawn from the findings of the study:

---

[1]Moore and Dobson, p. 3.

[2]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[3]Ibid., p. 13.

1. Educational schools do have different educational environments.
2. Educational environments as perceived by pupils who make up that environment can be measured.
3. Enrollment size of the school does not seem to influence the perceived educational environment.
4. Teacher education, both pre-service and inservice, needs to emphasize the relationship between the learning process and the perceived educational environment of the pupils constituting that environment.
5. More decisions regarding childrens' learning experience should be based on the assumption that for pupils their perception is the reality of the situation.[1]

Robert L. Sinclair in a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago presented research on similarity and variance among elementary schools as perceived by students. Differences between how students and teachers view schooling are investigated and last, the relationship between behavior of the school principal, the staff and educational environment is documented.[2]

The data accumulated indicate several similarities and differences among the elementary schools. The study indicates that schools appear to emphasize the value of work for its own sake, as well as the procedures and rules.

---

[1]Moore and Dobson, p. 14.

[2]Robert L. Sinclair, "Explorations in Perceived Educational Environment: Contextual Dimensions of Elementary Schooling" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1972).

Students' emphasis is not on the quality of their work but rather on how hard they work.

Students reported that schools are concerned about rules and regulations and that the teachers were responsive and friendly.

In regard to how the students and teachers view educational environment, the findings show that students and teachers differ in their perceptions of educational environment. Teachers tended to score higher on Humanism, Autonomy, Morale and Resource and lower on Alienation than do students.

In an analysis of principal and teacher behavior and educational climate evidence indicated that: (1) a high degree of relationship exists between the behavior of teachers and the educational environment, (2) the set of principal variables was significantly related to the set of teacher variables, and (3) the behavior of the school principal was related to the environmental variables.[1]

Throughout the research presented it indicates that there are variations in teacher and student environmental perceptions and behavior. The relations between perceptions of principals, teachers, students and parents creates a complex arena for research and study.

The following chapters are a result of the administration of the "CFK Climate Questionnaire" administered to

---

[1]Sinclair, loc. cit.

Administration, Parents, Teachers, Students and Others in the Greenwood School community.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

GENERAL DESIGN

Permission to conduct research was received in May, 1975, from Dr. Robert Denny, Assistant Superintendent for Education, Des Moines Independent Community School District.

A letter requesting permission to reproduce 100 copies of the CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was submitted to Cecelia L. Martin, Executive Assistant, CFK Ltd., 3601 South Gilpin Street, Englewood, Colorado. Written permission was received from Ms. Martin in April, 1975.

Application was made to Dr. Charles E. Cleveland, Director Academic Computing Services, Dial Computer Center, Howard Hall, Drake University to be assigned an account number. Permission was received and an account number assigned in September, 1975.

There were five groups selected to complete the School Climate survey which is an instrument designed to measure individual perceptions concerning various aspects of a school's program and organization. Ten survey forms were given to members of the Central Administrative Staff, of the Des Moines Schools, located at 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines. Ten individuals of the non-certificated personnel at Greenwood School received surveys; twenty-two

teachers, sixteen students and eighteen parents, also from Greenwood School were requested to complete the survey instrument.

Upon the return of the completed forms, responses were tabulated and key punched onto data cards. The appropriate ANOVA and t-tests were run by Dial Computer Center, Howard Hall, Drake University.

DATA AND INSTRUMENTATION

The CFK Ltd. School Climate Survey was administered to students, parents, central administrators, teachers and other support staff members.

The CFK Ltd. School Climate Survey was taken from a book published by Phi Delta Kappa entitled "School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator."

There are no reliability and validity results available on the CFK Ltd. School Climate Survey. The data provides what appears to be an excellent description of a school's climate.

The survey covers four areas: (1) general climate factors, (2) program determinants, (3) process determinants, and (4) material determinants.

The four areas are broken down with eight items in general climate factors, seven items in program determinants, eight items in process determinants and three items in material determinants for a total of twenty-six items, with

five statements following each item. Participants were requested to check what they thought occurred for "What Is" and what they felt "Should Be". Each participant was requested, for each statement, to check either "almost never" which received one point, "occasionally" which received two points, "frequently" which received three points, or "always" which received four points for each of the conditions, "What Is" and "What Should Be". The possible sum for each item ranged from five to twenty points for "What Is" and also for "What Should Be".

SAMPLES

There were five groups selected to complete the survey. The students completing the survey were the fourteen members of the student Senate at Greenwood School. The Senate was elected by vote in the fall of 1974. Each homeroom had an elected representative who served on the Senate. The individuals elected tended to be the leaders of their class group and generally the respected, more capable and reasonable students. The students range in grade level from first grade through sixth grade. (The survey was read to the individuals who participated.) There was a 78 percent return of the surveys from this group.

The central administration group was a sampling of directors, assistant directors, supervisors, consultants and coordinators who are located at the Board of Education

Office, 1800 Grand Avenue in Des Moines. Individuals selected were those who had spent time at Greenwood School and were familiar with the school. The survey was discussed with each individual and they were given a survey to complete. A stamped, return-addressed envelope was given along with the survey. There was a total of ten survey forms issued with a 50 percent return from this group.

The twenty-two certificated staff members at Greenwood School comprised another of the groups. (Individuals were given survey forms at a staff meeting in May of 1975 and were asked to complete it and return it to the school secretary at their earliest convenience.) There was a 100 percent return from this group.

The "other staff" group or non-certificated staff group consisted of the secretary, custodians, and lunch room personnel at Greenwood School. The survey was discussed with each individual and they were each given a form to complete and return to the school secretary at their earliest convenience. Eleven survey forms were given out with a 100 percent return from this group.

The parent group requested to participate in the survey consisted of the eighteen members of the Greenwood School Community Advisory Board. The survey was discussed with the Board members at the May, 1975, Board meeting and then mailed to each member with a stamped, return-addressed envelope. There was a 56 percent return from this group.

ANALYSIS

Tabulation was carried out for each returned questionnaire with the numerical data recorded for purposes of key punching. Key punching to data cards was completed at the Drake University Data Processing Center in Howard Hall (on campus).

The single factor Analysis of Variance program and the t-test for differences between correlated means were selected for computer analysis. The Scheffe test for pair comparisons was used whenever an ANOVA was found to be statistically significant.

The ANOVA's were run for mean differences between groups in responses given to the 26 items for "What Is" and for mean differences between groups in responses given to the 26 items for "What Should Be".

The analysis of variance is a convenient way to determine whether the means of more than two samples are different enough from each other that such differences are unlikely to be due to sampling error. If the samples are different enough to reject the null hypothesis, then the Scheffe method of comparison was used to compare differences between pairs of means.

For each of the 26 items, the mean response across all five groups was calculated for "What Is" and also for "What Should Be". At this point, t-tests for correlated

samples were used to determine if the difference between the respective pairs of means could be attributed to chance alone.

The .01 level was utilized to determine if a significant difference between means existed in all tests. This relatively conservative level was chosen because of the number of tests run and thus the need for somewhat stringent protection against Type I errors.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Permission was obtained from the Des Moines Independent Community School District's Assistant Superintendent for Education, Dr. Robert R. Denny, to perform the study. The school community selected for study was Greenwood Elementary School.

The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was administered to students, parents, central administration, teachers and non-certificated staff members associated with or served by this school. Responses to the profile questionnaire by these various groups comprised the data for this study. An Analysis of Variance for the differences between means of five groups (students, parents, central administration, teachers, and non-certificated staff members) on both "What Is" and "What Should Be" on each profile characteristic was run by Dial Finance Computer Center at Drake University. Difference between means for "What Is" and "What Should Be" for each characteristic in the combined groups was also run by this computer center using the t-test as the statistic.

The Scheffe method was used to compare differences between pairs of means in areas where the Analysis of Variance was significant.

Assumptions made regarding the study were: (1) individuals were honest in their responses, and (2) the

instrument selected was appropriate and adequate to find the desired information.

Limitations to the study are: (1) there is only one school community involved, and (2) there are only certain aspects of the school investigated, those pertaining to climate.

The following is a summary of results for all ANOVA tests for differences between group means in response to climate characteristics.

Table 1 shows the results for all ANOVA tests for mean differences between groups in responses to climate characteristics--"What Is" and "What Should Be".

In observing the mean differences between groups in responses to climate characteristics for "What Is" there appeared to be eight pairs of means that were significantly different.

The Scheffe method of comparison was used to compare differences between pairs of means when an ANOVA was statistically significant.

The following difference between pairs of means was significant as indicated by the Scheffe method.

For the item characteristic of: (1) Effective teaching-learning strategies "What Is" there is a significant difference between means for teachers and students and in this case the direction or difference is that students view this characteristic more positively than teachers.

Table 1

Summary of Results for all ANOVA Tests for Mean Differences Between Groups in Responses to Climate Characteristics-- "What Is" and "What Should Be"

Characteristics	F-Value "What Is"	F-Value "What Should Be"
Respect	1.651	1.270
Trust	1.153	1.273
High Morale	2.213	2.350
Opportunity for Input	2.445	1.495
School Renewal	3.957**	1.450
Caring	1.713	1.793
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	2.930*	.322
Cohesiveness	4.860***	.664
Active Learning	3.227**	.712
Individualized Performance Expectations	5.885***	2.667*
Varied Learning Environments	6.245***	3.300
Flexible Curriculum and Extracurricular Activities	4.520**	2.600*
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity	3.175**	.717
Rules Cooperatively Determined	3.221**	2.426*
Varied Reward Systems	5.277**	.952

*p < .5 2.52
**p < .01 3.65
***p < .001 5.31

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics	F-Value "What Is"	F-Value "What Should Be"
Problem Solving Ability	8.372***	1.034
Improvement of School Goals	3.836**	3.561
Identifying and Working with Conflicts	4.087**	.964
Effective Communications	4.528**	1.194
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies	5.801***	5.029**
Ability to Plan for the Future	4.685**	3.638
Involvement in Decision Making	5.638***	.801
Autonomy with Accountability	2.129	2.065
Adequate Resources	5.138**	.443
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System	5.870***	1.294
Suitability of School Plant	4.976**	.819

**p < .01 3.65
***p < .001 5.31

In the remainder of the items no significant differences were found when the pairs of means were compared.

In observing the mean differences between groups in responses to climate characteristics for "What Should Be" there were no pairs of means that appeared to be significantly different to warrant use of the Scheffe method of comparison. Appendix A shows the means for "What Is" by group and Appendix B shows the means for "What Should Be" by group.

Table 2 shows the means across all groups for "What Is" and for "What Should Be" and t-values for the differences between "What Is" and "What Should Be" by characteristic.

The results of comparing differences between means for "What Is" and "What Should Be" across all groups indicates that there is a significant difference between the "What Is" and "What Should Be" for each characteristic.

The direction of difference is that the "What Should Be" mean across all groups was greater than the "What Is" mean across all groups.

Table 2

Differences Between Means of "What Is" and "What Should Be" Across all Groups and t-Values for the Differences, by Characteristic

(1) Characteristic	(2) "What Is"	(3) "What Should Be"	(4) Difference (2) - (3)	(5) t-Value
Respect	18.371	19.435	-1.064	-6.43***
Trust	17.145	19.193	-2.048	-8.55***
High Morale	17.468	19.468	-2.000	-7.81***
Opportunity for Input	16.564	18.306	-1.742	-5.95***
School Renewal	17.032	19.048	-2.016	-7.59***
Caring	18.548	19.710	-1.161	-5.50***
Continuous Academic & Social Growth	17.274	19.081	-1.806	-7.67***
Cohesiveness	16.984	19.210	-2.226	-7.57***
Active Learning	15.855	18.258	-2.403	-8.03***
Individualized Performance Expectations	16.129	18.355	-2.226	-7.01***
Varied Learning Environments	15.210	17.435	-2.225	-6.82***
Flexible Curriculum & Extracurricular Activities	15.532	17.500	-1.968	-5.67***
Support & Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity	17.645	19.113	-1.468	-6.39***
Rules Cooperatively Determined	16.500	18.564	-2.064	-6.64***
aried Reward Systems	16.161	18.984	-2.823	-6.95***

Table 2 (continued)

(1) Characteristic	(2) "What Is"	(3) "What Should Be"	(4) Difference (2) - (3)	(5) t-Value
Problem Solving Ability	16.823	19.274	-2.452	-7.21***
Improvement of School Goal	17.242	18.645	-1.403	-5.20***
Identifying & Working with Conflicts	17.871	19.419	-1.548	-5.08***
Effective Communications	17.660	19.419	-1.032	-5.15***
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies	13.371	15.710	-2.339	-6.63***
Ability to Plan for the Future	16.742	18.081	-1.339	-5.32***
Involvement in Decision Making	17.323	19.000	-1.677	-5.60***
Autonomy with Accountability	16.532	17.871	-1.339	-4.66***
Adequate Resources	16.290	19.000	-2.710	-6.55***
Supportive & Efficient Logistical System	16.290	19.113	-2.823	-7.06***
Suitability of School Plant	16.710	19.629	-2.919	-7.35***

***p < .001

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile was administered to students, parents, central administration, teachers, and non-certificated staff members associated with or served by Greenwood School. Responses to the profile questionnaire by these various groups comprised the data for this study. An Analysis of Variance for the differences between means of five groups (students, parents, central administration, teachers, and non-certificated staff members) on both "What Is" and "What Should Be", on each profile characteristic, was run by Dial Finance Computer Center at Drake University. The Scheffe method was used to compare differences between pairs of means in areas where the Analysis of Variance was significant. Difference between means for "What Is" and "What Should Be" for each characteristic in the combined groups was also run by this computer center using the t-test as the statistic.

In comparing differences between pairs of means it was found that students view the item characteristic of "Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies" "What Is" more positively than teachers.

In comparing differences between means for "What Is" and "What Should Be" across all groups the "What Should Be" mean was greater than the "What Is" for each characteristic.

DISCUSSION

As groups the administration is most positive and the other school staff most negative in terms of the situation in this school as it now exists. Parents, teachers, and students were the second, third and fourth ranked in terms of "What Is".

The administrators have the highest scores and the other school staff the lowest scores in their description of what should exist in this school situation. Students, teachers and parents appeared in that order regarding what they felt should exist.

All groups rate "What Is" in a markedly positive direction and "What Should Be" in an even more positive position.

The teacher group tended to rate items pertaining specifically to learning as being less positive than most other items. The group also rated these items less positive in "What Should Be" than did the other groups.

The item characteristic "Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies" was rated least positive by the teacher group in terms of both "What Is" and "What Should Be". The parent group expectation for this item was only slightly more positive for what they felt "Should Be" as compared to their concept of "What Is". This same item had the least positive rating of all the items by the parent group in

terms of both "What Is" and "What Should Be".

The teacher group and the other staff group tended to be less positive than the other three groups in both "What Is" and "What Should Be" ratings. Administrators tended to be more positive than any of the other groups.

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of this study it can be concluded that:

1. There is very little difference in how students, parents, teachers, non-certificated staff, and central administration perceive the climate at Greenwood School.

2. The climate at Greenwood School, although perceived by the various groups as being good, is not ideal, i.e., there is perceived to be room for improvement since the "What Should Be" ratings were more positive than the "What Is" ratings throughout the climate factors scale.

3. Teachers are more critical of their own effectiveness than any of the other groups.

4. Administrators are the most positive about their school's climate of all the related groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based upon the findings of this study:

1. The CFK Ltd. Profile should be given in other elementary schools throughout the city of Des Moines. The

findings should be compared to see if there are differences between schools in various parts of the city in terms of specific climate characteristics.

2. A committee, made up of individuals representing the five groups who took the survey, should be appointed to study the results of the survey and make recommendations for improvements.

3. The CFK Ltd. Profile should be readministered to role groups at Greenwood School three years hence to see if there has been an improvement in the perceptions of climate characteristics of this school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boies, Herbert E., and Edward Brainard. "School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator," Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, p. 5.

Burden, Larry, and Robert L. Whitt. The Community School Principal. Midland, Michigan: Pendall Publishing Co., 1973.

Carver, Fred D., and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. Organizations and Human Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Cutt, Norma E., and Nicholas Moseley. Providing for Individual Differences in the Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960.

Halpin, Andrew W., and Donald W. Croft. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1966.

Johnson, Homer M., and R. Laverne Marcum. Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 028 517, February, 1969.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Litwin, George H., and Robert Stringer, Jr. Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston: Division of Research, Harvard University Press, 1968.

Moore, Donald, and Russell Dobson. "Elementary School Childrens' Perceptions of the Educational Environment," Final Report, Project Number 1F047, Contract Number OBC71-0523-(609), U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Education Research and Development. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, May 31, 1972.

Sadler, David, and Robert L. Sinclair. Dimensions of the Elementary School: A Factor Analytic Study. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 065 493, April, 1972.

Sinclair, Robert L. "Explorations in Perceived Educational Environment: Contextual Dimensions of Elementary Schooling." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1972.

Steinhoff, Carl R., and Robert G. Owens. Organizational Climate in the More Effective Schools. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 019 372, November, 1967.

Tagiuri, Renato. "The Concept of Organizational Climate," Organizational Climate, eds. Renato Tagiuri and George Litwin. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1968.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEANS FOR "WHAT IS" BY GROUP

Characteristics	Admin.	Parents	Teachers	Students	Other Staff
Respect	19.60	19.40	18.00	17.86	18.27
Trust	18.00	18.00	17.05	16.71	16.72
High Morale	19.60	18.50	17.05	16.93	17.09
Opportunity for Input	18.60	18.00	15.59	16.79	16.00
School Renewal	18.60	18.90	15.96	17.43	16.27
Caring	19.80	19.40	18.23	17.86	18.73
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	19.20	17.90	17.23	17.43	15.73
Cohesiveness	19.80	18.00	15.46	17.00	17.82
Active Learning	17.80	17.10	15.32	16.50	14.09
Individualized Performance Expectations	18.20	17.80	16.86	15.36	13.18
Varied Learning Environments	17.40	16.10	14.73	16.93	12.18
Flexible Curriculum and Extra-Curricular Activities	17.40	16.30	15.41	17.07	12.27
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity	19.40	18.20	16.91	18.56	16.64
Rules Cooperatively Determined	19.80	16.90	16.55	16.21	14.91
Varied Reward Systems	18.80	17.40	14.73	17.79	14.64

APPENDIX A (continued)

Characteristics	Admin.	Parents	Teachers	Students	Other Staff
Problem Solving Ability	19.40	18.80	14.36	18.21	17.00
Improvement of School Goal	19.60	16.80	17.41	18.28	14.91
Identifying and Working with Conflicts	19.80	18.70	16.32	19.14	17.73
Effective Communications	18.20	17.55	16.25	18.63	17.67
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies	15.80	13.20	11.27	16.92	12.09
Ability to Plan for the Future	19.00	17.10	15.68	18.86	14.82
Involvement in Decision Making	18.00	17.90	17.50	18.64	14.46
Autonomy with Accountability	18.40	16.60	15.73	17.71	15.73
Adequate Resources	18.40	18.00	15.14	18.21	13.64
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System	19.20	17.40	15.59	18.00	13.19
Suitability of School Plant	20.00	17.50	16.00	17.93	14.36

APPENDIX B

MEANS FOR "WHAT SHOULD BE" BY GROUP

Characteristics	Admin.	Parents	Teachers	Students	Other Staff
Respect	20.00	19.90	19.18	18.93	19.90
Trust	19.60	19.10	19.32	18.71	19.46
High Morale	20.00	19.50	19.86	18.71	19.36
Opportunity for Input	19.00	18.50	18.27	18.79	17.27
School Renewal	19.00	19.90	19.05	19.00	18.36
Caring	19.80	20.00	19.82	19.43	19.55
Continuous Academic and Social Growth	19.60	19.20	19.00	19.07	18.90
Cohesiveness	19.80	18.80	19.14	19.21	19.46
Active Learning	19.00	18.50	18.27	18.29	17.64
Individualized Performance Expectations	18.80	19.00	19.05	17.36	17.46
Varied Learning Environments	19.40	17.50	16.86	18.29	16.55
Flexible Curriculum and Extra-Curricular Activities	18.80	16.50	17.87	18.36	16.00
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity	19.80	18.90	19.05	19.36	18.82
Rules Cooperatively Determined	20.00	17.90	19.00	18.50	17.73
Varied Reward Systems	19.60	19.00	18.59	19.29	19.09

APPENDIX B (continued)

Characteristics	Admin.	Parents	Teachers	Students	Other Staff
Problem Solving Ability	20.00	19.40	18.91	19.57	19.18
Improvement of School Goal	19.60	17.10	19.27	19.00	17.91
Identifying and Working with Conflicts	19.80	19.10	19.32	19.93	19.09
Effective Communications	19.20	19.30	19.27	19.93	19.27
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies	18.20	13.90	14.32	18.93	14.91
Ability to Plan for the Future	19.60	18.00	17.00	19.71	17.55
Involvement in Decision Making	19.60	19.20	18.82	19.36	18.46
Autonomy with Accountability	19.00	17.30	17.23	18.71	18.09
Adequate Resources	18.80	19.20	18.64	19.21	19.36
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System	19.60	19.50	18.96	19.50	18.36
Suitability of School Plant	20.00	19.20	19.73	19.64	19.64

APPENDIX C

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS FOR "WHAT IS" AND "WHAT SHOULD BE"

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	(Difference) Mean	t-Value
Respect				
What Is	62	18.3710	-1.0645	-6.43
What Should Be		19.4355		
Trust				
What Is	62	17.1452	-2.0484	-8.55
What Should Be		19.1935		
High Morale				
What Is	62	17.4677	-2.0000	-7.81
What Should Be		19.4677		
Opportunity for Input				
What Is	62	16.5645	-1.7419	-5.95
What Should Be		18.3065		
School Renewal				
What Is	62	17.0323	-2.0161	-7.59
What Should Be		19.0484		
Caring				
What Is	62	18.5484	-1.1613	-5.50
What Should Be		19.7097		
Continuous Academic and Social Growth				
What Is	62	17.2742	-1.8065	-7.67
What Should Be		19.0806		

APPENDIX C (continued)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	(Difference) Mean	t-Value
Cohesiveness				
What Is	62	16.9839	-2.2258	-7.57
What Should Be		19.2097		
Active Learning				
What Is	62	15.8548	-2.4032	-8.03
What Should Be		18.2581		
Individualized Performance Expectations				
What Is	62	16.1290	-2.2258	-7.01
What Should Be		18.3548		
Varied Learning Environments				
What Is	62	15.2097	-2.2258	-6.82
What Should Be		17.4355		
Flexible Curriculum and Extracurricular Activities				
What Is	62	15.5323	-1.9677	-5.67
What Should Be		17.5000		
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity				
What Is	62	17.6452	-1.4677	-6.39
What Should Be		19.1129		
Rules Cooperatively Determined				
What Is	62	16.5000	-2.0645	-6.64
What Should Be		18.5645		

APPENDIX C (continued)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	(Difference) Mean	t-Value
Varied Reward Systems				
What Is	62	16.1613	-2.8226	-6.95
What Should Be		18.9839		
Problem Solving Ability				
What Is	62	16.8226	-2.4516	-7.21
What Should Be		19.2742		
Improvement of School Goal				
What Is	62	17.2419	-1.4032	-5.20
What Should Be		18.6452		
Identifying and Working with Conflicts				
What Is	62	17.8710	-1.5484	-5.08
What Should Be		19.4194		
Effective Communications				
What Is	62	18.3871	-1.0323	-5.15
What Should Be		19.4194		
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies				
What Is	62	13.3710	-2.3387	-6.63
What Should Be		15.7097		
Ability to Plan for the Future				
What Is	62	16.7419	-1.3387	-5.32
What Should Be		18.0806		

APPENDIX C (continued)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	(Difference) Mean	t-Value
Involvement in Decision Making				
What Is	62	17.3226	-1.6774	-5.60
What Should Be		19.0000		
Autonomy with Accountability				
What Is	62	16.5323	-1.3387	-4.66
What Should Be		17.8710		
Adequate Resources				
What Is	62	16.2903	-2.7097	-6.55
What Should Be		19.0000		
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System				
What Is	62	16.2903	-2.8226	-7.06
What Should Be		19.1129		
Suitability of School Plant				
What Is	62	16.7097	-2.9194	-7.35
What Should Be		19.6290		

APPENDIX D

THE CFK LTD. SCHOOL CLIMATE PROFILE

I am a:

___Student
___Parent
___Superintendent or central administrator
___Teacher
___Secretary, custodian or other non-certificated staff member

PART A General Climate Factors	What Is Almost Never	 Occasionally	 Frequently	 Almost Always	What Should Be Almost Never	 Occasionally	 Frequently	 Almost Always
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
RESPECT								
1. In this school even low achieving students are respected.								
2. Teachers treat students as persons.								
3. Parents are considered by this school as important collaborators.								
4. Teachers from one subject area or grade level respect those from other subject areas.								
5. Teachers in this school are proud to be teachers.								
TRUST								
1. Students feel that teachers are "on their side."								
2. While we don't always agree, we can share our concerns with each other openly.								
3. Our principal is a good spokesman before the superintendent and the board for our interests and needs.								
4. Students can count on teachers to listen to their side of the story and to be fair.								

PART A General Climate Factors (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
5. Teachers trust students to use good judgment.		
HIGH MORALE		
1. This school makes students enthusiastic about learning.		
2. Teachers feel pride in this school and in its students.		
3. Attendance is good; students stay away only for urgent and good reasons.		
4. Parents, teachers, and students would rise to the defense of this school's program if it were challenged.		
5. I like working in this school.		
OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT		
1. I feel that my ideas are listened to and used in this school.		
2. When important decisions are made about the programs in this school, I, personally, have heard about the plan beforehand and have been involved in some of the discussions.		
3. Important decisions are made in this school by a governing council with representation from students, faculty, and administration.		

PART A General Climate Factors (continued)	What Is Almost Never Occasionally Frequently Almost Always 1 2 3 4	What Should Be Almost Never Occasionally Frequently Almost Always 1 2 3 4
4. While I obviously can't have a vote on every decision that is made in this school that affects me, I do feel that I can have some important input into that decision.		
5. When all is said and done, I feel that I count in this school.		
SCHOOL RENEWAL		
1. When a problem comes up, this school has procedures for working on it; problems are seen as normal challenges; not as "rocking the boat."		
2. Teachers are encouraged to innovate in their classroom rather than to conform.		
3. When a student comes along who has special problems, this school works out a plan that helps that student.		
4. Students are encouraged to be creative rather than to conform.		
5. Careful Effort is made, when new programs are introduced, to adapt them to the particular needs of this community and this school.		
CARING		
1. There is someone in this school that I can always count on.		
2. The principal really cares about students.		

Part A General Climate Factors (continued)	What Is 1 Almost Never 2 Occasionally 3 Frequently 4 Almost Always	What Should Be 1 Almost Never 2 Occasionally 3 Frequently 4 Almost Always
3. I think people in this school care about me as a person; are concerned about more than just how well I perform my role at school (as student, teacher, parent, etc.).		
4. School is a nice place to be because I feel wanted and needed there.		
5. Most people at this school are kind.		
CONTINUOUS ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL GROWTH		
1. The teachers are "alive;" they are interested in life around them; they are doing interesting things outside of school.		
2. Teachers in this school are "out in front," seeking better ways of teaching and learning.		
3. Students feel that the school program is meaningful and relevant to their present and future needs.		
4. The principal is growing and learning too. He or she is seeking new ideas.		
5. The school supports parent growth. Regular opportunities are provided for parents to be involved in learning activities and in examining new ideas.		

PART A General Climate Factors (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1	 Occasionally 2	 Frequently 3	 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1	 Occasionally 2	 Frequently 3	 Almost Always 4
COHESIVENESS								
1. Students would rather attend this school than transfer to another.								
2. There is a "we" spirit in this school.								
3. Administration and teachers collaborate toward making the school run effectively, there is little administrator-teacher tension.								
4. Differences between individuals and groups (both among faculty and students) are considered to contribute to the richness of the school; not as divisive influences.								
5. New students and faculty members are made to feel welcome and part of the group.								

I am a:

___Student
___Teacher
___Parent
___Secretary, custodian, or other staff member
___Administrator in this school
___Superintendent or central administrator

PART B Program Determinants	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
ACTIVE LEARNING		
1. Required textbooks and curriculum guides support rather than limit creative teaching and learning in our school.		
2. Students help to decide learning objectives.		
3. Opportunities are provided under school guidance to do something with what is learned.		
4. Teachers are actively learning, too.		
5. This school's program stimulates creative thought and expression.		
INDIVIDUALIZED PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS		
1. Each student's special abilities (intellectual, artistic, social, or manual) are challenged.		
2. Teachers use a wide range of teaching materials and media.		
3. The same homework assignment is not given to all students in the class.		
4. All students are not held to the same standards.		

PART B Program Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never Occasionally Frequently Almost Always 1 2 3 4	What Should Be Almost Never Occasionally Frequently Almost Always 1 2 3 4
5. Teachers know students as individuals.		
VARIED LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS		
1. Many opportunities are provided for learning in individual and small-group settings, as well as in classroom-sized groups.		
2. Students have opportunity to choose associations with teachers whose teaching styles are supportive of the student's learning style.		
3. Teachers use a wide range of teaching materials and media.		
4. The school program extends to settings beyond the school building for most students.		
5. Teachers and administrators have planned individualized inservice education programs to support their own growth.		
FLEXIBLE CURRICULUM AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES		
1. The school's program is appropriate for ethnic and minority groups.		
2. Teachers experiment with innovative programs.		
3. Students are given alternative ways of meeting curriculum requirements.		

PART B Program Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
4. Teachers are known to modify their lesson plans on the basis of student suggestions.		
5. Extracurricular activities appeal to each of the various subgroups of students.		
SUPPORT AND STRUCTURE APPROPRIATE TO LEARNERS' MATURITY		
1. The school's program encourages students to develop self-discipline and initiative.		
2. The needs of a few students for close supervision and high structure are met without making those students feel "put down."		
3. The administration is supportive of students.		
4. The administration is supportive of teachers.		
5. Faculty and staff want to help every student learn.		
RULES COOPERATIVELY DETERMINED		
1. The school operates under a set of rules which were worked out with students, teachers, parents, and administration all participating.		
2. Rules are few and simple.		
3. Teachers and their students together work out rules governing behavior in the classroom.		

PART B Program Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
4. Discipline (punishment) when given is fair and related to violations of agreed-upon rules.		
5. Most students and staff members obey the school's rules.		
VARIED REWARD SYSTEMS		
1. The grading system rewards each student for his effort in relationship to his own ability.		
2. Students know the criteria used to evaluate their progress.		
3. Teachers are rewarded for exceptionally good teaching.		
4. The principal is aware of and lets staff members and students know when they have done something particularly well.		
5. Most students get positive feedback from faculty and staff.		

I am a:

___Student
___Teacher
___Parent
___Secretary, custodian or other staff member
___Administrator in this school
___Superintendent or central administrator

PART C Process Determinants	What Is Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always	What Should Be Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
PROBLEM SOLVING ABILITY								
1. Problems in this school are recognized and worked upon openly; not allowed to slide.								
2. If I have a school-related problem, I feel there are channels open to me to get the problem worked on.								
3. People in this school do a good job of examining a lot of alternative solutions first, before deciding to try one.								
4. Ideas from various ethnic and minority groups are sought in problem-solving efforts.								
5. People in this school solve problems; they don't just talk about them.								
IMPROVEMENT OF SCHOOL GOALS								
1. This school has set some goals as a school for this year and I know about them.								
2. I have set some personal goals for this year related to school, and I have shared these goals with womeone else.								

PART C Process Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never	 Occasionally	 Frequently	 Almost Always	What Should Be Almost Never	 Occasionally	 Frequently	 Almost Always
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3. Community involvement is sought in developing the school's goals.								
4. The goals of this school are used to provide direction for programs.								
5. The goals of this school are reviewed and updated.								
IDENTIFYING AND WORKING WITH CONFLICTS								
1. In this school people with ideas or values different from the commonly accepted ones get a chance to be heard.								
2. There are procedures open to me for going to a higher authority if a decision has been made that seems unfair.								
3. This school believes there may be several alternative solutions to most problems.								
4. In this school the principal tries to deal with conflict constructively; not just "keep the lid on."								
5. When we have conflicts in this school, the result is constructive, not destructive.								
EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS								
1. Teachers feel free to communicate with the principal.								
2. I feel the teachers are friendly and easy to talk to.								
3. The principal talks with us frankly and openly.								

PART C Process Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
4. Teachers are available to students who want help.		
5. There is communication in our school between different groups--older teachers and younger ones; well to do students and poorer ones; black parents and white parents, etc.		
EFFECTIVE TEACHING-LEARNING STRATEGIES		
1. The teachers in this school know <u>how</u> to teach as well as what to teach.		
2. When one teaching strategy does not seem to be working for a particular student, the teacher tries another; does not blame the student for the initial failure.		
3. This community supports new and innovative teaching techniques.		
4. Inservice education programs available to teachers in this building help them keep up-to-date on the best teaching strategies.		
5. The school systematically encourages students to help other students with their learning activities.		
ABILITY TO PLAN FOR THE FUTURE		
1. In this school we keep "looking ahead;" we don't spend all our time "putting out fires."		
2. Our principal is an "idea" man.		

PART C Process Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
3. Parents and community leaders have opportunities to work with school officials at least once a year on "things we'd like to see happening in our school."		
4. Some of the programs in our school are termed "experimental."		
5. Our school is ahead of the times.		
INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING		
1. Teachers help in selection of new staff members		
2. Parents help to decide about new school programs.		
3. Decisions that affect this school are made by the superintendent and the central staff only after opportunity has been provided for discussion and input from the school's principal, staff, and students		
4. I have influence on the decisions within the school which directly affect me.		
5. The student government makes important decisions.		
AUTONOMY WITH ACCOUNTABILITY		
1. Teachers, students, and parents help to evaluate this school's program.		

PART C Process Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1	 Occasionally 2	 Frequently 3	 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1	 Occasionally 2	 Frequently 3	 Almost Always 4
2. Teacher evaluation is used in improving teacher performance.								
3. Teachers or students can arrange to deviate from the prescribed program of the school.								
4. The principal encourages experimentation in teaching.								
5. Teachers are held accountable in this school for providing learning opportunities for each of their students.								

I am a:

___Student
___Teacher
___Parent
___Secretary, custodian or other staff member
___Administrator in this school
___Superintendent or central administrator

PART D Material Determinants	What Is Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always	What Should Be Almost Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost Always
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
ADEQUATE RESOURCES								
1. There is sufficient staff in this school to meet the needs of its students.								
2. The instructional materials are adequate for our school program.								
3. Curriculum materials used in this school give appropriate emphasis and accurate facts regarding ethnic and minority groups, and sex roles.								
4. Resources are provided so that students may take advantage of learning opportunities in the community through field trips, work-study arrangements, and the like.								
5. Current teacher salaries in this community give fair recognition to the level of professional service rendered by teachers to the community.								
SUPPORTIVE AND EFFICIENT LOGISTICAL SYSTEM								
1. Teachers and students are able to get the instructional materials they need at the time they are needed.								

PART D Material Determinants (continued)	What Is Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4	What Should Be Almost Never 1 Occasionally 2 Frequently 3 Almost Always 4
2. Budget making for this school provides opportunities for teachers to recommend and make judgments about priorities for resources needed in their program.		
3. The support system of this school fosters creative and effective teaching/learning opportunities rather than hinders them.		
4. Necessary materials, supplies, etc., for learning experiences are readily available as needed.		
5. Simple non-time-consuming procedures exist for the acquisition and use of resources.		
SUITABILITY OF SCHOOL PLANT		
1. It is pleasant to be in this building; it is kept clean and in good repair.		
2. This school building has the space and physical arrangements needed to conduct the kinds of programs we have.		
3. Students and staff are proud of their school plant and help to keep it attractive.		
4. The grounds are attractive and provide adequate space for physical and recreational activities.		
5. Current teacher salaries in this community give fair recognition of the level of professional service by teachers to the community.		

APPENDIX E

Analysis of Variance (One Way--Completely Randomized Design (Unequal))

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Respect "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	24.972	4	6.243	1.651
Due to Error (Within)	215.496	57	3.780	
Total Variance	240.468	61		
Respect "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	11.232	4	2.808	1.270
Due to Error (Within)	126.010	57	2.211	
Total Variance	137.242	61		
Trust "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	15.700	4	3.925	1.153
Due to Error (Within)	193.994	57	3.403	
Total Variance	209.694	61		
Trust "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	5.220	4	1.305	1.273
Due to Error (Within)	58.457	57	1.026	
Total Variance	63.677	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
High Morale "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	42.943	4	10.736	2.213
Due to Error (Within)	276.492	57	4.851	
Total Variance	319.436	61		
High Morale "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	12.942	4	3.235	2.350
Due to Error (Within)	78.494	57	1.377	
Total Variance	91.435	61		
Opportunity for Input "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	66.367	4	16.592	2.445
Due to Error (Within)	386.875	57	6.787	
Total Variance	435.242	61		
Opportunity for Input "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	17.775	4	4.446	1.495
Due to Error (Within)	169.403	57	2.972	
Total Variance	187.177	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
School Renewal "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	81.271	4	20.318	3.957
Due to Error (Within)	292.665	57	5.134	
Total Variance	373.936	61		
School Renewal "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	12.455	4	3.114	1.450
Due to Error (Within)	122.400	57	2.147	
Total Variance	134.855	61		
Caring "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	24.395	4	6.099	1.713
Due to Error (Within)	20.296	57	3.561	
Total Variance	227.355	61		
Caring "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	2.546	4	.636	1.793
Due to Error (Within)	20.229	57	.355	
Total Variance	22.774	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Continuous Academic and Social Growth "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	49.165	4	12.291	2.930
Due to Error (Within)	239.174	57	4.196	
Total Variance	288.339	61		
Continuous Academic and Social Growth "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	1.959	4	.489	.322
Due to Error (Within)	86.638	57	1.519	
Total Variance	88.597	61		
Cohesiveness "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	109.093	4	27.273	4.860
Due to Error (Within)	319.891	57	5.612	
Total Variance	428.984	61		
Cohesiveness "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	4.199	4	1.049	.664
Due to Error (Within)	90.075	57	1.580	
Total Variance	94.274	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Active Learning "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	80.812	4	20.203	3.227
Due to Error (Within)	356.882	57	6.261	
Total Variance	437.694	61		
Active Learning "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	7.605	4	1.901	.712
Due to Error (Within)	152.267	57	2.671	
Total Variance	159.871	61		
Individualized Performance Expectations "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	165.126	4	41.282	5.885
Due to Error (Within)	399.842	57	7.015	
Total Variance	564.968	61		
Individualized Performance Expectations "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	38.497	4	9.624	2.667
Due to Error (Within)	205.696	57	3.609	
Total Variance	244.194	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Varied Learning Environments "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	179.246	4	44.811	6.245
Due to Error (Within)	409.029	57	7.176	
Total Variance	588.274			
Varied Learning Environments "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	45.367	4	11.342	3.300
Due to Error (Within)	195.875	57	3.436	
Total Variance	241.242	61		
Flexible Curriculum and Extracurricular Activities "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	173.707	4	43.426	4.520
Due to Error (Within)	547.729	57	9.609	
Total Variance	721.436	61		
Flexible Curriculum and Extracurricular Activities "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	56.395	4	14.098	2.600
Due to Error (Within)	309.105	57	5.423	
Total Variance	365.500			

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learners' Maturity "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	52.601	4	13.400	3.175
Due to Error (Within)	240.592	57	4.220	
Total Variance	294.194	61		
Support and Structure Appropriate to Learner's Maturity "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	4.704	4	1.176	.717
Due to Error (Within)	93.505	57	1.640	
Total Variance	98.209			
Rules Cooperatively Determined "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	85.079	4	21.269	3.221
Due to Error (Within)	376.421	57	6.604	
Total Variance	461.500	61		
Rules Cooperatively Determined "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	26.660	4	6.665	2.426
Due to Error (Within)	156.582	57	2.747	
Total Variance	183.242	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Varied Reward Systems "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	157.921	4	39.480	5.277
Due to Error (Within)	426.466	57	7.482	
Total Variance	584.387	61		
Varied Reward Systems "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	6.699	4	1.675	.952
Due to Error (Within)	100.284	57	1.759	
Total Variance	106.984	61		
Problem Solving Ability "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	232.800	4	58.200	8.372
Due to Error (Within)	396.248	57	6.952	
Total Variance	629.048	61		
Problem Solving Ability "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	7.056	4	1.764	1.034
Due to Error (Within)	97.283	57	1.707	
Total Variance	104.339			

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Improvement of School Goal "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	105.487	4	26.372	3.836
Due to Error (Within)	391.884	57	6.875	
Total Variance	497.371	61		
Improvement of School Goals "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	44.821	4	11.205	3.561
Due to Error (Within)	179.373	57	3.144	
Total Variance	224.194	61		
Identifying and Working with Conflicts "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	101.399	4	25.349	4.087
Due to Error (Within)	353.569	57	6.203	
Total Variance	454.968	61		
Identifying and Working with Conflicts "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	6.786	4	1.697	.964
Due to Error (Within)	100.310	57	1.759	
Total Variance	107.097	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Effective Communication "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	49.736	4	10.795	4.528
Due to Error (Within)	37.102	57	2.827	
Total Variance	733.394	61		
Effective Communications "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	4.723	4	1.181	1.194
Due to Error (Within)	56.374	57	.989	
Total Variance	61.097	61		
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	321.867	4	80.467	5.801
Due to Error (Within)	790.601	57	13.870	
Total Variance	1112.468	61		
Effective Teaching-Learning Strategies "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	258.464	4	64.616	5.029
Due to Error (Within)	732.310	57	12.848	
Total Variance	990.774	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Ability to Plan for the Future "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	154.847	4	38.712	4.685
Due to Error (Within)	471.023	57	8.264	
Total Variance	625.871	61		
Ability to Plan for the Future "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	77.812	4	19.453	3.638
Due to Error (Within)	304.784	57	5.347	
Total Variance	382.597	61		
Involvement in Decision Making "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	121.207	4	30.302	5.638
Due to Error (Within)	306.342	57	5.374	
Total Variance	427.548	61		
Involvement in Decision Making "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	7.986	4	1.996	.801
Due to Error (Within)	142.014	57	2.491	
Total Variance	150.000	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Autonomy with Accountability "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	58.433	4	14.608	2.129
Due to Error (Within)	391.003	57	6.859	
Total Variance	449.436	61		
Autonomy with Accountability "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	29.238	4	7.309	2.065
Due to Error (Within)	201.729	57	3.539	
Total Variance	230.968	61		
Adequate Resources "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	210.081	4	52.520	5.138
Due to Error (Within)	582.694	57	10.223	
Total Variance	792.774	61		
Adequate Resources "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	5.606	4	1.402	.443
Due to Error (Within)	180.394	57	3.165	
Total Variance	186.000	61		

APPENDIX E (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean Square	Calculated F
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	212.619	4	53.155	5.870
Due to Error (Within)	516.155	57	9.055	
Total Variance	728.774	61		
Supportive and Efficient Logistical System "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	11.509	4	2.877	1.294
Due to Error (Within)	126.700	57	2.222	
Total Variance	138.209	61		
Suitability of School Plant "What Is"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	152.800	4	38.200	4.976
Due to Error (Within)	437.974	57	7.684	
Total Variance	590.774	61		
Suitability of School Plant "What Should Be"				
Due to Climate Profile (Between)	2.744	4	.686	.819
Due to Error (Within)	47.723	57	.837	
Total Variance	50.468	61		